



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,366	09/30/2003	Susan D. Woolf	13768.783.264.1	3219
47973	7590	09/25/2007		
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT			EXAMINER	
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER			HUYNH, THU V	
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE				
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			ART UNIT	
			PAPER NUMBER	
			2178	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			09/25/2007	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,366

Applicant(s)

WOOLF ET AL.

Examiner

Thu V. Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-28 and 35-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-28 and 35-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 07/11/07 to application filed on 09/30/03, which has the benefit of prior provisional filed on 05/19/03.
2. Claims 2, 7, 29-34 are canceled.
3. Claims 1, 3-4, 8-9, 13, 27, 35-37 are currently amended.
4. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-28, 35-37 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 13, 35 are independent claims.
5. All the rejections in the previous office action have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 1 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding independent claims 1 and 13, in last limitation of these claims recite “to those recipient subscribers that are on the list of subscribers to the first user’s/client’s annotations” has typographical error and inconsistency. The phrase “to the first user’s annotations” should be amended to “to those recipient subscribers that are on the list of subscribers r to access the first user’s/client’s handwritten annotations”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. **Claims 1, 3-6, 8-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being**

Art Unit: 2178

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding independent claims 1 and 13, these claims recite “distributing the first user’s handwritten annotations, to those recipient subscribers that are on the list of subscriber that are on the list of subscriber to the first user’s annotations”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Dependent claims 3-6, 8-12, 14-28 are rejected for fully incorporating the dependencies of their base.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2178

9. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, 15, 17, 21-23, 26-28, 35-37 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendriks et al., US 2003/0163525 A1, filed 02/22/02, in view of Bose et al., US 2002/0042830 A1, filed 04/2/01.

Regarding independent claim 1, Hendriks teaches the steps of:

- an act of receiving annotation data from a first user among the plurality of computer users, each user having annotation access to a public data entry area available to each of the plurality of users, the public data entry area for sharing handwritten annotations received from one or more of the plurality of users with one or more other of the plurality of users such that handwritten annotations appear to be written on a common display surface shared among the plurality of users (Hendriks; fig.3, [0032], [0038]; public handwritten annotations from clients/users are written into text or private field and sends to a server for distributing to be displayed in an area so that other clients/users can view such handwritten annotations);
- an act of determining that handwritten annotation data is public data (Hendriks; fig.3, [0032], [0038]; determining the handwritten annotations is public data to send to other clients);
- an act of automatically writing the handwritten annotation data of the first user to a public data entry area in response to the determination that the handwritten annotation data is public data (Hendriks; fig.3; [0031], [0035], message(s)/ handwritten annotation(s) are written into an shared area and sent to clients who joined the same instant message (IM) topic of interest);

Art Unit: 2178

- an act of adding at least one of the plurality of computer users to a list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first user's handwritten annotations (Hendriks; [0031]; [0033]; users join/register to an instant messaging topic of interest so that the clients/users are presented with recent messages from other clients/users); and
- an act of distributing the first use's handwritten annotations to those recipient subscribers that are on the list of subscribers to access the first user's annotations (Hendriks; figures 3, ; [0031], [0033], [0035], [0036], sending message(s)/ handwritten annotation(s) to clients/users who joined to the instant messaging topic of interest for accessing such annotations).

However, Hendriks does not explicitly teach denying at least one of the plurality of computer users from being added to the list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first user's handwritten annotations.

Bose teaches denying at least one of plurality of computer users from being added to the list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first user's handwritten annotations (Bose, [0094], [0114]; sending annotations to only one or subset of students).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bose's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to disallow at least one of clients/users who joined to the instant messaging topic of interest to access the annotations, since the combination would have allowed the user to select particular recipient as well as subset of recipients to have a right to access the user's annotations.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Hendriks teaches combining the annotation data with other annotation data on the public data entry area (Hendriks, [0032], [0038]; entered annotations from clients are combined, published and shared with other registered client).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Hendriks teaches the public data entry area corresponds to a page of a publication, and wherein receiving annotation data comprises receiving annotation corresponding to the page (Hendriks, [0032], [0038]; entered annotations from clients are combined shared with other register client, wherein the annotations are received from the public record field).

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Hendriks teaches wherein distributing the annotation data to at least one recipient subscriber comprises combining the annotation data with other annotation data on a graffiti page (Hendriks, [0032], [0038]; entered annotations from are combined shared with other register client).

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Hendriks teaches receiving annotation independent of any page of a publication (Hendriks, [0032]; receiving annotations in private area).

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Hendriks teaches automatically updating a subscriber (Hendriks, [0031]; client registers to join an interested session in real time)

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Hendriks teaches receiving a request from a computing device corresponding to a subscriber user, and wherein sending the annotation data comprises providing the annotation data in response to the request (Hendriks, [0050], client sends request sending annotations based on timeline).

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 1, Hendriks teaches persisting the annotation data (Hendrik, [0050]; persisting annotations for searching).

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Hendriks teaches receiving data corresponding to a page of a publication, and wherein persisting the annotation data comprises persisting the annotation data in association with the page (Hendriks, [0045],[0051]; linking annotations with current session record).

Claim 12 is for a computer storage medium having computer executable instructions performing the method of claim 1 and is rejected under the same rationale (In order to perform the steps of receiving and distributing the annotation data of claim 1 in a computer conference system, executable instructions must stored in the computer).

Regarding independent claim 13, Hendriks teaches the steps of:

- an annotation device that is a client of the server, the annotation device including an annotation program that manages handwritten annotations input by first client that is

- among the plurality of clients, each client having annotation access to a public data entry area available to each of the plurality of clients, the public data entry area for sharing handwritten annotations received from one or more of the plurality of clients with one or more other of the plurality of clients such that handwritten annotations appear to be written on a common display surface shared among the plurality of clients, and includes at least one operating mode configured to write the handwritten annotation data of the first client to a public data entry area in response to determination that the handwritten annotation data is public data (Hendriks; fig.3, [0032], [0038]; public handwritten annotations from clients are written into a layer of public recording field and sends to a server for distributing and to be displayed in an area so that other clients can access and view such handwritten annotations; “Annotations entered in the recording field are public and distributed to all users”);
- a determining mechanism that determines that the handwritten annotation data is public data (Hendriks; fig.3, [0032], [0038]; determining the handwritten annotations is public data to send to other clients);
 - a subscription determining mechanism configured to:
 - o add at least one of the plurality of computer client to a list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first client’s handwritten annotations (Hendriks; [0031]; [0033]; users join/register to a particular instant messaging topic of interest at any time so that the clients/users are presented with recent messages or annotations from other clients/users. This inherently discloses that a user who latterly joins/registers to the instant messaging topic of interest must be

Art Unit: 2178

add to a list of user who registered/joined to the instant messaging topic of interest so that such user is able to be presented with annotations from other users);

- a send mechanism that sends the first client's handwritten annotations to a server for distribution to those recipient subscribers that are on the list of subscribers to access the first client's annotations (Hendriks; fig.3; [0031], [0035], message(s)/annotation(s) are sent from a server to clients who joined the same instant message (IM) topic of interest for accessing).

However, Hendriks does not explicitly teach denying at least one of the plurality of computer clients from being added to the list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first client's handwritten annotations.

Bose teaches denying at least one of plurality of computer clients from being added to the list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first client's handwritten annotations (Bose, [0094], [0114]; sending annotations to only one or subset of students).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bose's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to disallow at least one of clients/users who joined to the instant messaging topic of interest to access the annotations, since the combination would have allowed the user to select particular recipient as well as subset of recipients to have a right to access the user's annotations.

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches the annotation program displays a page of a publication, and wherein the handwritten annotations are receive in

Art Unit: 2178

association with the displayed (Hendriks, figure 3 and 6; [0031]-[0032]; client annotates the document image in parallel with the display of predefined form in public field 1, wherein the predefined form is one page form).

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 15, Hendriks teaches the annotations program includes at least one other operating mode in which received handwritten annotations are private (Hendriks, fig.3, [0032], private ink area, such as input field 15 for previewing handwritten strokes).

Regarding claim 21, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches wherein one operating mode in which received handwritten annotations are to be published comprises a graffiti page canvas mode in which annotations are distributed by the server to any other client (Hendriks, fig.6, [0032], [0035], [0038]; ink annotations entered in public record field 1 are distributed by the server to any other client).

Regarding claim 22, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches the annotation device includes a receive mechanism that receives handwritten annotations published by at least one other client and provides those annotations to the annotation program for presentation (Hendriks, [0035], [0048], [0039]; server receives the annotations from a user and distributes to other user's computer for viewing and/or annotation).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 23, which is dependent on claim 21, Hendriks teaches the annotations device combines the received published handwritten annotations with the handwritten annotations input by the author for displaying to that author (Hendriks, fig.3; [0035], [0048], [0039]; a user selects a published annotation to add new annotations on public field 1, which is displayed on user computer).

Regarding claim 26, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches the received handwritten annotations correspond to a graffiti mode in which any client receives data from any publisher that is operating in the graffiti mode (Hendriks, [0032], [0035]; ink annotations entered from any author in public record field 1 of a session are distributed by the server to any other client who joined in the session).

Regarding claim 27, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches the annotation device further comprises a mechanism for subscribing to receive the public handwritten annotations of another client (Hendriks, [0031], the user joins to interest group).

Regarding claim 28, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches the annotation device further comprises a mechanism for filtering which annotations are presented (Hendriks, fig.3, "Search" button; [0050]; searching annotations based on timeline and content)

Regarding independent claim 35, Hendriks teaches the steps of:

- an act of an annotation program receiving from a computer user handwritten annotation data for selectively sharing via a public data entry area, each user having annotation access to a public data entry area available to each of the plurality of users, the public data entry area for sharing handwritten annotations received from one or more of the plurality of users with one or more other of the plurality of users such that handwritten annotations appear to be written on a common display surface shared among the plurality of users (Hendriks; fig.3, [0032], [0038]; public handwritten annotations from clients are written into a layer of public recording field and sends to a server for distributing to be displayed in an area so that other clients can view such handwritten annotations; “Annotations entered in the recording field are public and distributed to all users”);
- an act of adding at least one of the plurality of computer users to a list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first user’s handwritten annotations (Hendriks; [0031]; [0033]; users join/register to an instant messaging topic of interest so that the clients/users are presented with recent messages from other clients/users); and
- an act of sending the first user’s handwritten annotation data to a server for combining with other handwritten annotation data on the public data entry area in response to determination that the first user’s handwritten annotation data is public data and that those computer users that are to be recipients of the first user’s handwritten annotation data combined with the other handwritten annotation data subscribed to access the first user’s handwritten annotations (Hendriks; fig.3; [0031], [0035],

message(s)/annotation(s) are sent from a server to clients who joined the same instant message (IM) topic of interest).

- an act of a computer user receiving from the server an updated public data entry area including the first user's handwritten annotation data and the handwritten annotation data entered by other computer users of the plurality of computer users (Hendriks; fig.3; [0031], [0035], updating handwritten annotation(s) are sent to clients who joined the same instant message (IM) topic of interest).

However, Hendriks does not explicitly teach denying at least one of the plurality of computer clients from being added to the list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first client's handwritten annotations.

Bose teaches denying at least one of plurality of computer clients from being added to the list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first client's handwritten annotations (Bose, [0094], [0114]; sending annotations to only one or subset of students).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bose's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to disallow at least one of clients/users who joined to the instant messaging topic of interest to access the annotations, since the combination would have allowed the user to select particular recipient as well as subset of recipients to have a right to access the user's annotations.

Regarding claim 36, which is dependent on claim 31, Hendriks teaches using a time-based filter to limit the annotations displayed with the document on the public data entry area to

Art Unit: 2178

those annotations input before a certain time or date (Hendriks, [0050], displaying handwritten annotation based on timeline).

Regarding claim 37, which is dependent on claim 31, referring to the rationale relied to reject claim 35. The combination of Hendriks and Bose teaches “using an author-based filter to limit the annotations displayed with the document on the public data entry area to those annotations input by one or more specified users” is included. The rationale is incorporated herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2178

11. **Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendriks and Bose as applied to claims 13 above, and further in view of Hendler et al., US 2002/0042833 A1, filed 12/29/00.**

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks does not explicitly teach the send mechanism comprises a background send thread of the annotation device.

Hendler teaches background process/thread is used to send data to a server while client computer is executing another process (Hendler, [0087]; “while the client computer 410 is executing a first module, a background process may send control data 415 to a server”).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hendler’s teaching and Hendrik’s teaching to include a background thread/process to send data (annotation) to the server, since the combination would have allowed the user to interact with annotation program while sending annotations, such as instead of waiting sending process is completed in order to write another annotation, the user is able to write another annotation while sending a previous annotation.

12. **Claims 16, 19, 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendriks and Bose as applied to claims 13 and 15 above, and further in view of Rothrock et al., US 5,729,687, filed 12/20/93.**

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Hendriks teaches wherein the send mechanism provides an identity of the author and ink data corresponding to the ink annotations to the server (Hendriks, figures 5A, 5B and 5C, “Bob’s annotation ink”, “The house Bob circled” and “Bob’s annotation stroke data” are sent to server in order to distributing to other clients).

However, Hendriks does not explicitly disclose sending an identifier of the page of the publication to the server.

Rothrock teaches page identifier is used in a page list to provide annotation when the user request for viewing or manipulating (Rothrock, col.7, lines 54-67 and col.8, lines 13-23; conference participant requests for viewing or manipulate the annotation information in particular page using page list which contains page identifiers).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Rothrock's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to send the page identifiers of a publication or form for storing in the server, since the combination would have allowed the user to retrieved annotations based on each page of the form or publication to distribute to the user.

Regarding claim 19, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks teaches one operating mode in which received ink annotations are to be published comprises a presentation in which annotations are distributed by the server to subscriber (Hendriks, figure 3 and 6; [0031]-[0032]; client annotates the document image in parallel with the display of a predefined form in public field 1. The annotations are distributed to a group of users by the server). However, Hendriks does not explicitly teach a presentation page notation mode.

Rothrock teaches one operating mode in which received annotations are to be published comprises a presentation page notation mode in which annotations are distributed to subscriber (Rothrock, col.7, lines 54-67; col.7, lines 54-67 and col.8, lines 13-23; conference participant

Art Unit: 2178

requests for viewing or manipulate the annotation information in particular page using page list which contains page identifiers).

Regarding claim 20, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks does not disclose wherein one operating mode in which received ink annotations are to be published comprises a shared canvas mode corresponding to a publication page in which annotations are distributed by the server to any other client in association with that publication page.

Rothrock teaches wherein one operating mode in which received ink annotations are to be published comprises a shared canvas mode corresponding to a publication page in which annotations are distributed to any other client in association with that publication page (Rothrock, col.7, lines 54-67; col.7, lines 54-67 and col.8, lines 13-23; entered annotations from users in plurality pages in application public workspace are combined, displayed and shared with other conference participants by per-page corresponding to a page being presented).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Rothrock's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to annotate on a shared canvas, since the combination would have provided one page per conference as well as plurality of pages per conference to share annotations among conference participants.

Regarding claim 25, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks does not teach the received annotations correspond to a shared canvas mode in which any client receives data from any other annotations publisher in association with a publication page.

Art Unit: 2178

Rothrock teaches the received annotations correspond to a shared canvas mode in which any client receives data from any other annotations publisher in association with a publication page (Rothrock, col.7, lines 54-67; col.7, lines 54-67 and col.8, lines 13-23; entered annotations from users in plurality pages in application public workspace are combined, displayed and shared with other conference participants by per-page corresponding to a page being presented).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Rothrock's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to annotate on a shared canvas, since the combination would have provided one page per conference as well as plurality of pages per conference to share annotations among conference participants.

13. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendriks and Bose as applied to claim 13 above and further in view of Kloubakov et al., US 2002/0103708 A1, filed 01/30/02.

Regarding claim 18, which is dependent on claim 13, Hendriks does not teach the annotations program provides at least one warning to the author when the operating mode is one in which the input ink annotations are to be published.

Kloubakov teaches different user interface modes are available for a user to activate and a visual indicator tells the user that particular user interface mode is activate (Kloubakov, [007]-[0008]).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Kloubakov's teaching and Hendriks' teaching to provide

Art Unit: 2178

a visual indicator for public and/or private field when such field is activate, since the combination would have indicated the user what field the annotation is entered.

14. **Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendriks and Bose as applied to claim 21 above and further in view of Nakai et al., US 6,170,016 B1, filed 12/09/98.**

Regarding claim 24, which is dependent on claim 21, Hendriks does not explicitly teach the receive mechanism comprises a background receive thread.

Nakai teaches background process/thread is used to receive data in (Nakai, col.3, lines 44-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Nakai's teaching and Hendrik's teaching to include a background thread/process to receive data (annotation) from the server, since the combination would have allowed the user to interact with annotation program while receive annotations, such as instead of waiting receiving process is completed in order to write another annotation, the user is able to write another annotation while receiving a annotation from other user.

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments filed on 07/11/07 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2178

Applicants argue that “Hendriks fails to teach or suggest denying at least one of the plurality of computer users from being to the list of subscribers that are subscribed to access the first user’s handwritten annotations” (Remarks, page 11, last paragraph).

However, the combination of Bose and Hendriks teaches such limitation as explained in the rejection above.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Goddberg et al., US 20020080170 A1, filed 3/01, teaches information management system.

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2178

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu V. Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4126. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TVH
September 9, 2007


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Application/Control Number: 10/676,366

Page 22

Art Unit: 2178